**Remarks**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 27-30 have been amended. Claims 1-30 are pending, of which claims 1, 11, 21, 27 and 29 are independent.

Regarding the claim objections, Applicants apologize for the clerical errors; they have been corrected as suggested by the Examiner.

General Comments

Regarding the rejections generally, the claim amendments include adding the limitation to every independent claim series that playback occurs after a broadcast of said video information" and that playback may be paused without losing synchronization between stored video information and stored associated web content.

It is submitted neither Mankovitz (WO 98/48566) nor published US patent application to Butler (US 2002/0007493) teach or suggest the recited combination of post-broadcast access to video content, and allowing pausing playback without losing synchronization with the stored associated web content as recited in the claimed embodiments. In particular, it appears both Mankovitz and Butler presume accessing content during a broadcast. While Butler notes in passing some content may be pre-loaded the night before it is to be used (see col. 5 ¶61), there is no discussion or hint of storing accessed content and received video for display after the end of a broadcast using the content. Thus, it is submitted the claim amendments render the grounds for rejections moot, and passage to issuance of the pending claims is respectfully solicited.

**35 USC §102(b)**

Claims 1-2, 7-12, and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Mankovitz. Applicants again thank the Examiner for the careful attention paid to the present matter, and in particular, posing a question that helps clarify our respective thinking on the present matter. If the present argument is not persuasive, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned before issuing a first Action in the RCE as it would likely help conclude prosecution of the present matter.

Regarding the question posed in the Action on page 2 ¶1 on whether Mankovitz can render web pages without storing them, Applicants submit this is possible. It seems from the language in the Action, see, e.g., Action page 5, second paragraph, that the Examiner feels Applicants are turning a blind eye to the Action's position. This is not the case. As discussed below, it is believed Mankovitz only intends to store links rather than the content identified by a link, and this content, according to Mankovitz, is only accessed dynamically in response to a request from a viewer rather than accessed and stored as recited. For example, see Mankovitz at page 1 lines 16-17 in which it is stated the "PRI is typically contained in an Internet site," e.g., ***not*** stored locally. Or at page 1 lines 27-29 in which it is further stated a viewer "can choose to link to through a connection with an Internet Service Provider." Or, as indicated at page 2 lines 30-32 in which it is stated the "microcontroller is configured to retrieve the Internet site address from memory and retrieve the PRI from the Internet site in response to a first viewer command." From these various statements, it is clear what Mankovitz stores is a link to

content, and ***not*** the content to which the link refers, hence Mankovitz ***can*** render web pages without storing their contents.

It is important to note there is a significant difference between, for example, claim 1's retrieving and saving content versus Mankovitz's retrieving and rendering web content identified by a web link ***if and when*** access is requested by a viewer. Such "on the fly" access and rendering does ***not*** require the content be stored as recited in the claims. Thus, as identifier or link to content is ***not*** the same as the content referenced by the identifier, hence the Action at the bottom of page 4 ¶1 incorrectly equates the retrieved web content with "36". An example to illustrate this distinction would be a link presented in a broadcast to streamed content such as a music file of the theme for the broadcast. Mankovitz would not retrieve and store the music file, instead it would simply access it over the network, e.g., stream it, ***if and when*** a user requests it. This is not what is claimed. Thus, it is submitted Mankovitz does not teach or suggest the recited retrieval/storage of web content associated with a web broadcast, and hence for this reason alone the §102 rejections cannot stand. Also, Mankovitz fails to teach the amended pausing playback and for this reason alone, the §102 rejections also cannot stand. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully solicited.

**35 USC §103(a)**

Claims 1-2, 7-12, and 17 also stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being obvious in view of Butler. Applicants submit these rejections are moot in light of the foregoing amendments. In particular, Butler states at ¶19 that the Butler "preferred embodiment of the invention" is one where a "broadcast source 12 broadcasts an

analog or digital video stream and provides supplemental digital data files to accompany the video stream." Thus, as with Mankovitz, there is no teaching or suggestion of the recited storing of video and associated web content for playback to occur after completion of a broadcast of the video, nor is there any teaching or suggestion of providing for pausing playback while maintaining synchronization with associated web content.

Consequently, it is submitted that since Butler fails to teach or suggest archiving broadcasted content for later playback, and fails to teach or suggest pausing playback, as recited in the claimed embodiments, it therefore would not be obvious to implement the recited embodiments (as amended) based on Butler as suggested by the Office.

Dependent claims 3, 13, and 26 stand rejected as being obvious over Mankovitz or Mankovitzs further in view of Butler. Dependent claims 4-6, 14-16 stand rejected as being obvious over Mankovitz or Mankovitzs further in view of Butler and Blackketter. Applicants submit these rejections are moot in light of the foregoing amendments, and thus the rejections of the dependent claims are not being substantively addressed at this time in order to focus attention on the allowability of the independent claims. It is submitted that while these claims are believed to introduce limitations not taught or suggested by the cited portions of the documents relied on by the Office, these claims are also allowable for at least the reason as depending from allowable base claims.

**Conclusion**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit all rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if the foregoing amendments are deemed unpersuasive as such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 20, 2004

Steven D. Yates
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 42,242
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

20 August 2004
Date of Deposit

Deborah L. Higham
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

8-20-04
Signature Date